COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TOUR

17 September 1986

1. Corcoran Gallery of Art, 17th and New York Avenue, N. W.

2. Ft. Myer Officers Club, from Wright Gate next to Iwo Jima Memorial

3. Chinese Gate Sites, 5th and H Streets, N. W. (OMITTED)

4. New residence, 4668 Broad Branch Road, N. W. from Brandywine

Those in attendance:

Commissioner Hart

Commissioner Wolf

Donald Myer

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 September 1986

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Confirmation of approval of 12 June 1986 minutes.

B. Approval of 31 July 1986 minutes and confirmation of actions.

C. PortAmerica: Report on statement presented to the National Capital Planning Commission on 4 September 1986.

D. Dates of next meetings:

16 October 1986, 10:00 A.M. (Thursday)

20 November 1986, 10:00 A.M. (Thursday)

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of State, International Center

CFA 18/SEP/86-1, Van Ness and Reno Road, N. W. Revised design for new security and maintenance facility. (Previous CFA 12/JUN/86-4, and CFA 31/JUL/86-2)

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 18/SEP/86-3, Pennsylvania Avenue pedestrian lights. (Previous CFA 10/MAR/81-4)

C. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

1. CFA 18/SEP/86-4, Arlington National Cemetery, Visitors Center. Final designs for parking garage and landscaping. (Previous CFA 13/NOV/85-2, CFA 21/FEB/86-4, CFA 12/JAN/86-5)

2. CFA 18/SEP/86-2, Fort Myer Officers' Club. Proposed elevator addition.

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Public Works

CFA 18/SEP/86-5, 3412 Dent Place, N. W. Firehouse No. 5. Renovation plans.

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-193, and -194, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Raze two-story apartment building and construct new office/apartment structure.

b. O.G. 86-172, 3025 P Street, N. W. Rear addition to residence. Revised concept design.

c. O.G. 86-176, 1233-1235 37th Street, N. W. Side addition to residence. Concept design.

d. O.G. 86-236, 1692 31st Street, N. W. Rear addition and other alterations. Revised concept design.

e. O.G. 86-210, 3246 S Street, N. W. New single-family residence. Final submission.

f. O.G. 86-225, 3350 M Street, N. W. Forrest-Marbury House. Confirmation of final working drawings.

g. Appendix I.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, 18 September 1986

PM 1:00 III. LUNCHEON RECESS

PM 1:30 IV. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS (resumed)

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-148, Fifth and H Streets, N. W. Gateway proposed by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association.

b. S.L. 86-153, 4668 Broad Branch Road, N. W. New single-family residence. Concept design.

c. S.L. 86-154, 17th and New York Avenue, N. W. The Corcoran Gallery of Art. Office space addition. Concept design.

d. Appendix II.

F. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

1. CFA 18/SEP/86-6, Naval Research Laboratory. New Physics Laboratory.

2. CFA 18/SEP/86-7, Naval Observatory, Observatory Circle and Massachusetts Avenue. Emergency Power Building addition.

3. CFA 18/SEP/86-8, Naval Security Station, Nebraska and Massachusetts Avenue. New security walls for entrance gates.

OLD GEORGETOWN ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-189	2902 O Street, N. W. Mt. Zion United Methodist Church	Curb cut with parking

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed off-street parking area as indicated in submittal received and dated 6 August 1986. Parking area would require curb cut and removal of existing street tree which would be against Commission policy for residential neighborhoods.

O.G. 86-206	1609 33rd Street, N. W. Jagdish Katyal	Raze garage

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for razing of existing garage building. (See O.G. 86-138.)

O.G. 86-207	3300 M Street, N. W. 3300 M Street, N. W., Limited Partnership	Construction fence and sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for temporary construction fence and one, single-faced sign not to exceed 25 square feet. Request removal of sign to coincide with removal of adjacent construction fence.

O.G. 86-208	1554 35th Street, N. W. Georgetown Visitation Convent	Renovation and alteration

ACTION: No objection to concept. While most work not visible from public space, recommend that proposed repointing of brickwork at street use mortar matching existing joints.

O.G. 86-209	1329 30th Street, N. W. Knowlson Gift	Fence repair

ACTION: Request additional information. Material provided with submission is insufficient for review. Commission staff has called agent's number listed on application on several occasions without making contact.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-211	1530 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Suter's Tavern, Inc.	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alteration and repair. Recommend that side street windows be constructed to match existing two-over-two, double-hung windows at second floor (note changes to drawing).

O.G. 86-212	1504 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Another World	Sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. No objection to concept of either sign. However, recommend simplification of sign shape and hanging of door sign from soffit within doorway.

O.G. 86-213	1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W. Coldwell Banker	Signs

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed neon sign and corresponding hanging sign shown in submission received and dated 13 August 1986 and attached supplementary material dated 18 August. Neon is inappropriate to the C and O Canal National Historical Park and a wooden hanging sign is inappropriate to the existing building. Recommend study of alternatives, including a panel sign behind the show window lighted by concealed floods and a wall-mounted sign at the street in character with the building.

O.G. 86-214	3417 N Street, N. W. Ted C. Wolter	Building front alteration

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. No objection to concept of removing existing doorway surround and sidelights or to concept as proposed. Recommend development of bolder surround in character with wood structure and a new door design in sympathy with the vertical requirements of the doorway itself.

O.G. 86-216	3213 Volta Place, N. W. Blatt Berg	Addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed additions and renovation work as shown in drawings received and dated 13 August 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-217	1229 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Esprit De Corp	Building front alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alteration to existing building front. All remaining window trim will be painted black.

O.G. 86-218	1225 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Alice M. Craven Trust	Renovation and addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation and addition as shown on drawings received and dated 13 August 1986. Grillwork members within openings at rear of addition overlooking alley are too thin at 3/8" diameter and should consist of iron bars approximately one inch in diameter. (Note drawing.)

O.G. 86-219	3116 M Street, N. W. Jean Paul Ansallem	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign and antique railing with lights as shown in submission received and dated 13 August 1986.

O.G. 86-220	3721-3749 Winfield Lane, N. W. Porten Sullivan Corporation	New townhouses - Building Group 11

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new townhouses as shown on working drawings received and dated 13 August 1986. Action includes work shown on approved landscape drawings dated 19 August.

O.G. 86-221	1692 31st Street, N. W. Regina Porten	Addition - Conceptual

ACTION: Void. Superseded by case number O.G. 86-236.

O.G. 86-223	1518 32nd Street, N. W. A. Graham Down	One-story addition

ACTION: No objection. Not visible from public space.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-224	1513 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Aux Eleganza, Inc.	Building front alteration

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed storefront alteration as shown in drawing received and dated 13 August 1986. Proposed design is not sympathetic to character of building; internally-illuminated transparent awning is not appropriate to the historic district. Recommend greater conformance to existing conditions and character of building.

O.G. 86-226	3225 Grace Street, N. W. Georgetown Park	Alteration

ACTION: Recommend against the issuance of permit for the purpose of enclosing some or all the recessed balconies on both the Canal and Grace Street at the Georgetown Park Condominiums. Such changes would not be an improvement to the exterior of the building.

O.G. 86-227	1355 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Aux Eleganza, Inc.	Display window

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement of existing entrance door with wood framed show window as shown on drawing received and dated 18 August and revised in red ink. The revision indicates a painted wood panel below the proposed window rather than stucco so as not to distract from the existing stuccoed doorway pier.

O.G. 86-228	3288 M Street, N. W. Carlos Bentos	Awning

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Recommend installation of shallow, shed-type box awning with lettering at front only in a dark green vinyl to match neighboring property.

O.G. 86-229	1513 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Aux Eleganza, Inc.	Storefront alteration

ACTION: Recommend against the issuance of permit. New design (see O.G. 86-224) is even less compatible with existing building than previous submissions. Any alterations to the building must utilize the framework of the existing storefront which dates from 1922. The Commission staff is available to the applicant should there be any question.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-231	1214 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Hilde Horn (The Coach Store)	Storefront renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed storefront alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 26 August 1986. Note supplemental drawing dated 12 September which enlarges clerestory moldings at soffit.

O.G. 86-233	1232 36th Street, N. W. F. Scott's	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for renovation work shown on drawing received and dated 28 August 1986. Sign(s), if there are to be any, should be submitted under separate application.

O.G. 86-238	3721-3749 Winfield Lane The Cloisters	Foundations and retaining walls

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for excavation and foundation work only as indicated in submission material received and dated 4 September 1986. Proposed stone retaining walls are not approved at this time but require review by the Commission as a separate case item.

O.G. 86-205	2900 M Street, N. W. Pierre Gaunoux	Windows and doors

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed renovation and alterations. Drawings submitted indicate little change from previous submission (see O.G. 86-89), and are not acceptable.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-130	2850 Woodland Drive, N. W. RAD Investments	Alterations and additions: Conceptual

ACTION: Subsequent information has shown that project site is not in Commission jurisdiction.

S.L. 86-134	800 17th Street, N. W. Riggs Bank	Replacement windows

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacing existing aluminum-framed, single-paned windows with multipaned, double-glazed windows divided by wood muntins as shown on drawing received and dated 30 July 1986. Note that approval does not extend to closing existing windows at floor above proposed work as indicated on drawing but not mentioned in application.

S.L. 86-135	1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Harvey Stein	Signs

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed non-illuminated signs shown on drawings received and dated 6 August 1986. As hung behind the windows, the signs will have a clear Plexiglas ground, 3 feet square, with red letters and piping.

S.L. 86-137	2121 Park Road, N. W. John D. Rockefeller IV	Swimming pavilion

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed swimming pool pavilion as shown in working drawings received and dated 6 August 1986. Design conforms to previously approved concept. (See S.L. 86-62.)

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-138	500 H Street, N. W. Comfort Inn	Signs

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed internally-illuminated plastic signs which are located inappropriately and exceed maximum allowable size and lettering height. Recommend reduction in size of letters and relocation of proposed signs to ground floor of building within confines of rusticated brick bands. (Note changes in red pencil as shown on returned drawing.) No objection to proposed lettering on valance or end panels of entrance canopies. Request resubmission of permit application for wall-mounted signs, showing revised location, prior to issuance of permit.

S.L. 86-139	16 Kalorama Road, N. W. Frank Wisner	Air conditioning

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit. Proposed air conditioning units will not be visible from public space and will have virtually no visual effect on adjacent property.

S.L. 86-140	3126 Woodley Road, N. W. Mr. and Mrs. Peter W. Bernstein	Air conditioning

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit. Proposed air conditioning units will not be visible from public space and will have virtually no visual effect on adjacent property.

S.L. 86-141	3126 Woodley Road, N. W. Mr. Peter W. Bernstein	Alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed revision to entrance walk as shown in material received and dated 13 August 1986.

S.L. 86-142	806 15th Street, N. W. Madison Management Corporation	Awnings

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the proposed erection of twelve, green vinyl awnings only. Awnings or canopies at central or corner entrances are not approved as such additions would be detrimental to the architectural integrity of the building. Any lettering contemplated in the future must be confined to the valance of the new awnings, or be subject to the issuance of separate sign permits.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-143	3227 Adams Mill Road, N. W. David and Susan Dlouhy	Fence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for completion of fence.

S.L. 86-144	2140 F Street, N. W. John Courembis	Alteration and renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation and alteration of existing historic structure provided that new brickwork terminate at height of first floor door sill and that heads of basement window and door have brick jack arches as indicated by changes shown on drawings received and dated 20 August 1986. (Note O.G. 86-98.)

S.L. 86-145	625 Indiana Avenue, N. W. 625 Indiana Avenue Associates	Excavation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed excavation and shoring work as described in application received and dated 26 August 1986 for new building approved in concept form by Commission of Fine Arts 9 October 1985. Working drawings, material samples and final details shall be submitted to Commission for approval prior to issuance of permit for above-grade building.

S.L. 86-146	5105 16th Street, N. W. Christ Lutheran Church	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed illuminated directory sign as shown in drawings received and dated 22 August 1986.

S.L. 86-149	144 D Street, S. E. Mark Powden	Renovation

ACTION: No objection to design of proposed spiral stair, new railings or addition of third floor deck provided that it is confined to area of existing porch. Recommend restudy of ground floor door and windows which are not appropriate to character of existing house or spirit of enclosed porch. Windows should be double-hung and spaced along entire width of building. Wood door should be glazed in similar style to existing second floor door. Board and batten siding is not appropriate. Recommend fascia board over windows and door with wood panels below windows.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-158	2025 Rosemont Avenue, N. W. Williams and Donovan	Alterations

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 8 September 1986.

S.L. 86-151	3550 Williamsburg Lane, N. W. Sidney Harman	Tennis Court with retaining walls

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit. Proposed tennis court and retaining walls will not be visible from Rock Creek Park. Local ANC had been contacted for notification without response 10 September 1986.

S.L. 86-150	2121 Park Road, N. W. Senator and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller IV	Garage and tool house building: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept for proposed garage and tool house buildings shown in drawing received and dated 28 August 1986 and supplementary site plan received on 15 September. Proposed design replaces previously approved concept (see S.L. 86-34) for carriage house complex. Submit working drawings for review and approval by Commission when ready.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202–566–1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 September 1986

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:
Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Carolyn J. Deaver
Hon. Frederick E. Hart
Hon. Neil H. Porterfield
Hon. Diane Wolf

Staff present:
Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
Mrs. Sue A. Kohler

National Capital Planning Commission staff present:
Mr. Patrick Tribe

(The order on the printed agenda was changed and the Submissions and Reviews presented first, to accommodate the applicants present.)

I. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of State, International Center

CFA 18/SEP/86-1, Van Ness and Reno Road, N. W. Revised design for new security and maintenance facility. (Previous CFA 12/JUN/86-4, and CFA 31/JUL/86-2) Mr. Carson recalled that a new design had been presented at the July meeting, and in response to the members' request at that time, further modifications had now been made, specifically, to the third story windows, to make them more compatible with the first two stories. He introduced Michael Newell from the State Department who reviewed briefly the changes that had been made since the first submission, and then introduced the architect, William Lenyk from the Leo A. Daly Company. Mr. Lenyk showed

the members old and new drawings of the building, with its entrance tower and two wings, and pointed out previous reductions in height and mass. He noted its central location, with the main entrance facing the central park, and said the building would function as a "Town Hall" for the Center. He pointed out the attempts to make the third floor relate more closely to the others: the rectangular form of the columns had been carried all the way up, rather than changing to round at the third floor, and the tripartite window division had also been carried through.

The redesigned third story windows consisted of a butt-jointed central bay flanked by side sections made up of small panes of glass.

The Chairman reviewed his previous criticism of the horizontal, strip-window effect of the third story, and he said he was not sure his objections had been met in the new design. He thought masonry mullions rather than butt joints might solve the problem. Overall, he thought the building was much better than the original submission, and although not of great merit, would be acceptable. Mr. Porterfield and Mr. Hart agreed. Miss Wolf asked about provision for parking; Mr. Lenyck said the four underground levels would accommodate approximately 250 cars, which would meet NCPC's requirements and accommodate the staff and Secret Service adequately. There were no further questions, and a majority of the members indicated their approval of the project, subject to the recommendations made by the Chairman. Exhibit A

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 18/SEP/86-3, Pennsylvania Avenue pedestrian lights. (Previous CFA 10/MAR/81-4) Mr. Carson said these would be the third, last, and smallest of the fixtures agreed upon for the avenue. He said their design had been an ongoing project, last reviewed, without a favorable reaction, in March 1981. Mr. Carson then introduced James Rich from PADC to present the new design. Mr. Rich began with a few slides of the avenue, showing the high mast highway lights, the Washington globe decorative lights, street furniture, and the rows of trees and exceptionally wide slidewalks along the avenue which had to be considered in the lighting proposals. Drawings were shown of the proposed new pedestrian light which would light the sidewalk: it consisted of a brown-grey painted cast iron standard, 10 feet tall, branching at the top to hold twin globes. He said the lights would be placed one foot from the tree grates (to the east) of the row of trees closest to the street; they would also be used further in, along the second row of trees, in places where the width of the sidewalk or lack of sufficient light in the buildings warranted their use.

Mr. Hart said he thought the avenue already looked too cluttered with street furniture and questioned the need for another light standard.

Mr. Rich said the sidewalks were very wide and dark, because of the trees and the lack of bright lighting on the ground floors of most of the buildings, and people did not feel safe. The Chairman said this Commission was actually coming in on the tail-end of a long period of discussion of avenue lighting, and he reviewed what had gone on before. He said there had been many studies, and it had finally been determined that three kinds of light were needed: the high mast lights for traffic, the Washington globe to provide a decorative ribbon of light all the way along the street to the Capitol, and a third light for pedestrians. He said the light from the Washington globe did not penetrate far enough back into the sidewalk area because of the trees, and its brightness could not be increased because it would then be too glary. Without brightly lit shops in the buildings, the sidewalk remained dark. He said he thought this new light was about the best that could be done.

Mr. Hart said he would like to inspect present conditions at night, and Mr. Porterfield asked why just one globe couldn't be used. Mr. Rich said that, aesthetically, it hadn't worked out; one globe, oriented toward the sidewalk, took on a "wilted lily" appearance. In answer to another question from Mr. Porterfield, he said the lights would be placed so they would have a uniform appearance along the avenue. Miss Wolf asked why the existing lights could not be improved so they would light the sidewalk, especially as the new lights would cost $950,000. Mr. Rich said they had been developed for different needs, and could not be adapted successfully. He noted attempts to attach supplemental lights to the Washington globe standards and even to the trees themselves. There was some criticism of the "modern" appearance of the lights, which Mr. Rich answered by saying they had not wanted to compete with the decorative quality of the Washington globe. He noted also that the standard would have some fluting and had been designed to be compatible with the design of the tree grates. Photographs of night-time mockups were shown. There were no further questions, and it was agreed that the Commission would approve the lights, in view of the many years of study and review that had preceded this submission. Exhibit B

C. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

1. CFA 18/SEP/86-4, Arlington National Cemetery, Visitors Center. Final designs for parking garage and landscaping. (Previous CFA 13/NOV/85-2, CFA 21/FEB/86-4, CFA 12/JAN/86-5). The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had asked to see final landscaping, lighting and paving details, as well as material samples, and he introduced architect Donald Lethbridge to make the presentation. Mr. Lethbridge reported first that the Visitors Center had been bid and groundbreaking would take place in October; he said he hoped the site work would be underway in a few months.

Mr. Lethbridge began his presentation with a discussion of the material for the parking garage. He noted that the structure would be about 700 feet long, with the leading edge formed by deep planters, broken up into 90 foot modules, which would be further articulated every 30 feet. They would be faced with a warm grey, non-reflective, flame-finished granite; he showed a sample. The coping would be the same granite with a honed finish. Columns would be concrete, in a warm neutral color, lightly sandblasted. The Chairman thought perhaps the finish on the granite should be more rusticated, since the structure will be in a park-like setting; he suggested a bush-hammered finish. Mr. Lethbridge thought that would be more expensive and perhaps not possible on the 2 inch thick slabs. He said he would check into this and also ask about degrees of roughness available in the flame finish. Mr. Hart suggested that a pitched finish might also be possible. Miss Wolf thought there was too much quartz in the granite, making it too reflective; Mr. Lethbridge said he would look at other samples. The Chairman thought the amount of planting intended would help reduce the visibility of the long walls. It was suggested that a mockup would be useful. In regard to the planting plan, Mr. Porterfield said he would like to see a complete list of plants as well as accurate landscaping drawings.

Mr. Lethbridge then turned to the design of the entrance gates to the Visitors Center, which had been slightly modified. He said that when it had been decided to set them back 15 feet from Memorial Drive, they had to be changed to swing outward. He showed drawings of black steel gates, a much simplified version of the McKim, Mead & White design at the Memorial Gate. The gateposts, of the same granite used on Memorial Drive (Cold Spring grey) would be set at the back edge of the hedge that runs along the drive. A Classical design for the eight light fixtures to be used in the courtyard area was shown next. He said the wattage would be kept low, and the type of light would be the same as that used on Memorial Drive. The Chairman said he hoped it would continue to be incandescent, and noted that the Commission would want to be informed if any change were contemplated.

A design for the Tourmobile shelters, to the west of the Visitors Center, was shown next. Mr. Lethbridge said that while they had to be sizeable structures, they would not be high and would not be visible from Memorial Drive. Drawings showed an arbor-like structure with precast columns, wood beams and a copper roof. There would be a circular down-light in the center of the ceiling. It was suggested that vines be allowed to grow on the structure to make it a true arbor.

Path lighting in the parking area was then discussed. Mr. Lethbridge showed catalog cuts of 2 foot high cast aluminum post lighting, dark bronze in color. These would be spaced at 50 foot intervals, and the light would measure only .2 footcandles. Inside the garage, underneath the overhangs, shielded can lights would be used; the light would measure 2 footcandles, below normal for this use. The members were concerned that the post lighting for the paths looked too modern, and Mr. Lethbridge was asked to investigate using a stone post. Miss Wolf asked that he inquire about a metal example with a globe light that she had seen used at Little Dix, a Rockefeller development in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Lethbridge showed drawings of the paving plan for the Visitors Center courtyard. He said the semicircular area in the central courtyard would be smooth granite and the remaining area would be paved with precase blocks, in tan and grey, set in a flemish bond pattern. He showed samples of these materials. Miss Wolf asked about using all granite; Mr. Lethbridge said it would be very expensive as the paving would extend to the Tourmobile area and on the other side to the parking garage. The Chairman said he thought that might be too much granite; he thought the precast could actually look better.

Mr. Lethbridge said there were also a number of signs to consider. First, there was a sign directing motorists to a loop leading to routes 1 and 110. He said he hoped at some time this loop could be removed, but in the meantime he was proposing a smaller sign, and 100 feet east of that, a sign saying "Visitors Center Parking". Smaller signs, saying "Visitors Center" and "Parking", would be placed near the entrances to these facilities. He said the lettering would be either Times Roman or Helvetica. There were no objections to these proposals.

Miss Wolf asked about design of trash receptacles, and Mr. Lethbridge said he would bring designs for these and other similar items later.

There were no further questions and approval was unanimously given, contingent upon review of an accurate landscaping plan and further investigation of granite to be used on the parking garage and the design of the path lights. Exhibit C

2. CFA 18/SEP/86-2, Fort Myer Officers Club. Proposed elevator addition. The Assistant Secretary noted that Miss Wolf and Mr. Hart had toured the site on the preceding day, and the other members had received photographs of the project. He showed the photographs and said the proposal was to remove the 1950's entrance motif from the Romanesque style building and replace it with a canopy and a tower, in the style of the original building, that would contain a handicapped entrance and elevator. He said approval had been given by the

Virginia SHPO and the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. There were no objections and the project was unanimously approved.

Exhibit D

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Public Works

CFA 18/SEP/86-5, 3412 Dent Place, N. W. Firehouse No.5. Renovation plans. In introducing this project Mr. Carson commented that it was not technically an Old Georgetown Act case, since it was a D. C. Government building, but as a courtesy it had been shown to the Georgetown Board. The Board had no specific objections but did not see a detail drawing of the new doors or a color sample for the wood screening to be placed on the roof, and so asked that these items be shown to the Commission. Mr. Carson introduced Charles Pavlick from the District government to make the presentation, and he in turn introduced several representatives from the fire department and the architect, Mr. Dunstan, who discussed the proposal. Mr. Dunstan said there would be substantial interior renovation, but it would not affect the exterior of this early firehouse (built in 1898) except for new doors to accommodate larger equipment and the placing of mechanical equipment on the roof. He said the doors would be custom-made so that the existing opening would not be disturbed and he showed the members a drawing. Mr. Carson pointed out the fact that the windows in the new doors would be plexiglas, and he said the staff had been concerned about this. The members agreed that glass would be preferable, and Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Pavlick said this would not create a problem. Mr. Dunstan then showed elevation drawings, pointing out the wood board screening on the roof to cut down the noise from the mechanical equipment. He showed a sample of the redwood-stained board. Mr. Porterfield thought it would look better if the brick parapet were just continued around the building to screen the equipment; the other members agreed this would be preferable. Mr. Pavlick said the equipment was really not visible from public space and the primary purpose of the screening was to cut down on the noise. He said he would have to investigate both the structural and economic consequences of continuing the parapet. Mrs. Suzanne Johnson, who lives next door to the firehouse, said she had asked the fire department to do something to cut down on the noise and had been very pleased with their cooperation; she added, though, that she did think the equipment would be visible from public space. Mrs. Alicia Boyd, representing the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, said she had also been pleased with the cooperation, and she thought the case was an example of the benefits attained when the community was informed of upcoming projects at an early stage.

Mr. Hart asked Mr. Pavlick if preservation of the early firehouses was a general policy with the department and was told that it was, unless deterioration was extreme or necessary equipment could not be accommodated. Mr. Hart commented that there were many very handsome old stations, and often when a new one was built, such as the one at 17th and U, it was not compatible with the architecture of the neighborhood.

The renovation plans were unanimously approved in general, with the provision that safety glass replace the plexiglas in the doors, and that Mr. Pavlick study the possibility of continuing the brick parapet on the roof rather than using wood screening for the mechanical equipment. Exhibit E

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-193, and -194, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Raze two story apartment building and construct new office/apartment structure. The Assistant Secretary referred the members to the material in their folders, consisting of reports, letters, and actions taken previously on this project, and said the present submission was for both demolition of an existing structure and a design for its replacement. He introduced architect Shalom Baranes to begin the discussion.

Mr. Baranes reviewed the history of the project, recalling an October 1985 submission to the Georgetown Board (reviewed on 6 November), modifications made as a result of that review, and another submission to the Board on 3 December, resulting in further, more specific requests for changes. At that time the Board recommended that the Commission approve design development providing those specific concerns were met. He recalled a revised design, incorporating these changes, that was shown to the Commission on 11 December 1985; he showed early and revised designs, pointing out the design evolution. At the 11 December meeting the Commission requested more landscaping, roof and cornice changes and consideration of additional setbacks; these were complied with. After some delay, the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board voted to approve the demolition of the existing building. Mr. Baranes then recalled that although the Commission seemed to like his building when it was reviewed in December (a statement with which the Chairman said he could not fully agree), when he resubmitted it to the Georgetown Board in July they reversed themselves and turned it down, saying it intruded on the landscape and neighboring small houses. He then turned to a discussion of the existing Cherry Hill apartments. He said he had hired two architectural historians who said the building was not typical of the high quality work of its architects, Hunter & Bell, did not represent an early example of the garden apartment building type (as had been claimed), but was, in fact, more aptly characterized as workers' housing; they said it did not meet the criteria for preservation stated in the Old Georgetown Act.

Several times during Mr. Baranes' presentation the question of approval of demolition of this building was brought up by Miss Wolf and Mrs. Boyd. Mrs. Boyd said there was some question as to whether

the Historic Preservation Board's action would stand, because of objections by the ANC to some procedural matters. She also reported that the Board's staff report had recommended against demolition, but the Assistant Secretary noted that this report had not been adopted by the Board. Mrs. Boyd said both the ANC and the Citizens Association were against demolition, and she read letters, taking the same position, from Robert Lyle, librarian of the Peabody Room at the Georgetown Library, and Wynant Vanderpool, president of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown. She commented also on the pending resolution of an alley closing request that might limit the size of the new building. She asked that the Commission consider only the demolition at this meeting, not the design of a new building.

Miss Wolf said that when the project came up, the on site inspection she had been taken on by the staff only showed the Wisconsin Avenue facade of the building. She was not shown the alley on the south side of the building nor Cecil Place on the north side of the building. She pointed out that since the north and south facades were the longer sides of the building and of equal importance to the Wisconsin facade and since she had become more fully acquainted with the site on her own, she had now changed her mind and was in opposition to the demolition. She said Mr. Baranes' photographs showed the building in an unflattering light, and he had none that showed Cecil Place. She said the construction of Dodge Center had blocked the waterfront view and changed the character of the area, and if the new building were allowed, the entire alley would be bounded by new construction.

Mr. Hart said it was not possible to please everyone, but it was possible to be fair. He said no particular merit had been ascribed to the existing building before this meeting, and he thought the Commission should abide by its previous decision. Mr. Porterfield said he could not separate the project into two parts--demoliton and new construction--and thought they had to be considered together. He thought the matter of ambiance was a design question, not dependent on retention of the old building; in other words, the Commission was facing a problem of urban design rather than one of historic preservation. He said he wanted the same results as the citizens did, but he liked the new building and thought that with careful detailing the quality of the space could remain; he thought the character of the north and alley sides were most important.

William Cochran, an owner of one of the small houses to the north, asked to comment. He said the windows planned for the north facade where it would extend beyond these houses were particularly damaging and would invade the privacy of the residents. Peter Schwartz, the developer for the new building, said he would be happy to remove the first floor windows and work with the residents on the possible removal of others.

The Chairman said it was evident that the Commission was faced with a difficult decision, both in regard to razing an old building and

approving the design of a new one. He said the site was on a shadowline, where the large-scale, warehouse-type construction on the waterfront ended and the residential scale began. He said the damage had been done by the Dodge Center, and any changes north of it would have to take its mass into consideration. He thought the new building did have the advantage of mediating between the two scales and was good enough to allow the demolition of the old building, although he acknowledged there were good arguments on the other side. Mr. Porterfield said the one thing he regretted was the loss of open space; the Chairman agreed, although he said the space as existing was not well articulated and was overwhelmed by the mass of the Dodge Center.

Mr. Hart made a motion, seconded and agreed to, that (1) the demolition of the existing building be approved, and (2) the design of the new building be approved, subject to working out the number and location of the windows on the north side. On each count the majority voted for approval, with Miss Wolf dissenting. Exhibit F

II. LUNCHEON RECESS

Because the meeting was running behind schedule, it was adjourned at this point in the agenda for lunch, at 1:15 p.m., and reconvened at 1:50 p.m.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS (resumed)

1. Old Georgetown Act (continued)

b. O.G. 86-172, 3025 P Street, N. W. Rear addition to residence. Concept design. The Assistant Secretary recalled that the first submission of this project to the Georgetown Board had been considered too large and in violation of the Commission's policy on additions to houses, as well as requiring a curb cut. There had been several revisions, with the Board recommending the third one for design development. He read the Board's report, which advised that the new addition would not harm, and would in fact benefit, the old residence, with the provision that detailing clearly differentiate old and new construction.

Architect Richard Stauffer was introduced, and he showed the earlier designs, photographs of the site, and the design recommended for development by the Georgetown Board, which some of the members had seen at the 31 July meeting. Mr. Hart asked about the lot coverage; Mr. Moore, the owner, said there were in fact two lots, and the total coverage, considering both lots, would be only 31%, as compared to 25% at present. Mr. Hart said the addition was actually saving open space, since the vacant lot adjoining the old house could no longer be considered a building lot once the addition went up.

Mrs. Boyd asked to comment. She noted that some houses face the alley behind P Street and the new addition would be visible from their front yards. She read the Commission's policy on additions to houses, and said that while the most recent design was an improvement, she questioned whether it was good enough; she thought it should be no higher than the original back building. She also asked that since the old model had been destroyed, a new one should be requested so that the effect could be seen. Mr. Moore commented on the low ceiling heights in the original back building and said they were no longer legal for new construction in the District. Mr. Stauffer said he had thought the drawings would show the relationship between the two elements well enough, and Mr. Porterfield agreed; he asked how far the back wall of the addition would be from the alley and was told 40 feet. It was noted that other additions along the alley came as close as twenty feet and that there were garages directly on the alley.

Mr. Hart said he saw no reason to object to the design, and as the trade-off in conservation of open space was so great, he would make a motion to approve the addition with no further discussion. The Chairman agreed, saying that all critical points had been thoroughly examined. The majority of the members agreed, and the concept design was approved, with Miss Wolf dissenting. Exhibit F

c. O.G. 86-176, 1233-1235 37th Street, N. W. Side addition to residence. Concept design. Mr. Carson said that at the Georgetown Board's meeting on 4 September the members had agreed with the Commission's assessment at the 31 July meeting that an infill structure here would restore the historic character of the block, and that rather than set it back, as the Board had first recommended, it would be best to follow the architect's original site plan and let it come up to the street like the neighboring houses. Mrs. Kohler was then asked for her report on the history of the existing house. She said it had been built in 1891 for a modest sum, and its neighbor at 1235, now demolished, had been built in 1889. She noted that while in 1887 the real estate map showed the entire street front empty with the exception of a house at the southern end, all lots had been built on by 1894.

Mrs. Boyd thought the addition would change the streetscape, and she noted the small side yards characteristic of this block. The Secretary got out the Baist real estate map to show the members, and it was noted that the proposed addition would keep the small side yard that existed previously, to accommodate the side entrance of the neighboring house. The Chairman asked if the Board had come to a decision as to whether the new addition should have an entrance door, for appearance's sake; he was told that it was not considered necessary. Mr. Hart said he could not see the difference between this addition and a permissible new house of the same size. The Chairman agreed and thought that keeping the addition close to the street made it look more

like another house rather than an addition. Miss Wolf disagreed with the statement that all the houses came out to the street, and she thought a setback would provide more open space and also make it possible to save a crabapple tree growing near the street. Mr. Porterfield disagreed, saying the setback would make it look more like a large addition. Miss Wolf thought it essential that each member inspect the site. Mr. Porterfield agreed that site inspections were generally desirable, but he said that after many years in the field of landscape architecture, he could visualize this particular situation with no difficulty. The Chairman recommended that the applicant look into planting a crabapple in front of the new structure. There was no further discussion, and when the Chairman asked for a vote, the majority of the members voted to approve the concept design and siting for the addition, with Miss Wolf dissenting. Exhibit F

d. O.G. 86-236, 1692 31st Street, N. W. Rear addition and other alterations. Revised concept design. Mr. Carson reviewed the several submissions for this project: the original version, a smaller one approved by the Commission in June, and a different design, the result of zoning requirements, that was still smaller. The latter had been reviewed twice by the Georgetown Board, and after changes had been made to the front stoop and conservatory, was now being recommended for approval. Patrick Purnell of the architectural firm of Cass & Purnell, showed drawings of the proposed addition, pointing out the changes requested by the Board. There were no objections and the design was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

e. O.G. 86-210, 3246 S Street, N. W. New single-family residence. Final submission. The Assistant Secretary said the Board had approved the final version in August and that there had been only subtle changes since the Commission had last seen the project. He introduced the architect, Winthrop Faulkner, who pointed out on a model the changes to the front gates and the addition of narrow windows on the west elevation. He also discussed the proposed landscaping along the street and within the walled area. There were no questions, the Chairman commended him on the design, and it was given unanimous approval. Exhibit F

f. O.G. 86-225, 3350 M Street, N. W. Forrest-Marbury House. Confirmation of final working drawings. The Assistant Secretary said the final drawings had been reviewed by the staff and found to conform to those approved earlier by the Commission. He pointed out a model and a perspective rendering of this restoration and new construction project, and introduced the owner, George Gerber. The members expressed their satisfaction with the project, wished Mr. Gerber success, and unanimously approved the final drawings. Exhibit F

g. Appendix 1, approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-148, Fifth and H Streets, N. W. Gateway proposed by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. This project was withdrawn temporarily.

b. S.L. 86-153, 4668 Broad Branch Road, N. W. New single-family residence. Concept design. Mr. Carson showed photos of the site, noting that Miss Wolf and Mr. Hart had visited it the preceding day. He said drawings of the proposed house had been shown to the neighbors, and thus far there had been no objections. He introduced the owner-builder, Mr. Witmer, and the architect, Scott Stinson. Mr. Witmer said he had contacted all the neighbors but one, the owner of the contemporary house next door. Mr. Stinson said there were many architectural styles in the area, and he did not think his Classical design would be out of place. Mr. Porterfield emphasized the importance of keeping as many trees as possible and protecting them during construction. He asked to see a landscape plan, and it was also suggested that brick samples should be seen. Other than these recommendations there were no objections and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

(The order of the agenda was changed and the Navy projects discussed next.)

F. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

1. CFA 18/SEP/86-6, Naval Research Laboratory. New Physics Laboratory. The Assistant Secretary introduced Frank Gerlach from the Navy to discuss the three projects on the agenda. He located the site for the Physics Laboratory and said the new addition would match the existing building. The Chairman said it really could not be seen from public space and asked for comments. There were none, and the addition was unanimously approved. Miss Wolf said she had been told it was difficult for the members to see these sites because of security regulations, and she requested that in the future the necessary clearances be obtained well in advance. Exhibit G

2. CFA 18/SEP/86-7, Naval Observatory, Observatory Circle and Massachusetts Avenue. Emergency Power Building addition. Mr. Gerlach showed drawings of this addition, noting that the equipment in the building was used to power the National Clock. It was set well back, would be landscaped, and again, it was noted that it could not be seen from public space. The addition was unanimously approved. Exhibit H

3. CFA 18/SEP/86-8, Naval Security Station, Nebraska and Massachusetts Avenue. New security walls for entrance gates. Mr. Gerlach showed drawings for installations at two gates, one near the street and the other far from public view. He said their purpose

was to intercept trucks trying to force entry into the Security Station. There were no objections to the designs and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit I

(The printed agenda order was resumed. Mrs. Deaver left the meeting before the next submission.)

III. E. 2. Shipstead-Luce Act (resumed)

c. S.L. 86-154, 17th and New York Avenue, N. W. The Corcoran Gallery of Art. Office space addition. Concept design. The Assistant Secretary noted that Miss Wolf and Mr. Hart had seen the site, and then introduced the architect, Warren Cox. Mr. Cox said the addition would be on the site of the present parking lot, behind the original building designed in 1897 by Ernest Flagg. He said it would be an office building for the present, but at least part of it could be converted to gallery use later. He said the design was a continuation of the parti of the original building, closely resembling it in architectural detail, and would consist of 4 floors of underground parking, an English basement, 5 floors of office space, and an attic. He said it would be below the maximum height permitted. The director of the Corcoran, Michael Botwinick, was then introduced. He said he liked the building and so did his board, especially because it respected the original building and was not a tower. The Chairman asked some questions about potential gallery use of the building; Mr. Botwinick said they hoped soon to be able to put gallery offices in the new building and free up space in the old building for exhibition use. Miss Wolf questioned the use of the vocabulary of double and single dormer windows. Mr. Cox agreed and would study them further. There was no further discussion and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit F.

White House Security Barriers (A National Park Service submission not on the printed agenda.) James McDaniel of the Park Service said a great deal of study had gone into this project and concepts had changed. He added that the criteria of the Secret Service were turned over to the Park Service for development into architectural form. Mr. McDaniel then noted for the members' information that the 200th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone for the White House would be held on 13 October 1992. He then asked Michael Summerlin to report on progress made on the security barrier design since the last meeting.

Mr. Summerlin recalled the several concepts presented to the members in July and the favorable reaction to one using all bollards. He said a mock-up had been arranged, viewed by the staff, and photos sent to the members. He said the consensus had been that the concrete bollards were better than the black metal ones, but details of the exact form were requested, and so he had brought several versions with him. He showed three: (1) a simple, slightly splayed concrete bollard with a low domed top; (2) a similar form with some architectural detail near the top; and (3) one with a reveal where the chain was attached.

The members preferred the first, because of its simplicity, but were still not happy with the chain. Mr. Porterfield said that perhaps it could be eliminated, but the Chairman thought it was important because it helped give the bollards a helpful apparent purpose other than security, i.e. a message to the pedestrian not to cross in mid-block. It was thought that making the chain heavier and adding a little more slack between bollards would solve the problem.

Exhibit J

IV. ADMINISTRATION

A. Confirmation of approval of 12 June 1986 minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

B. Approval of 31 July 1986 minutes and confirmation of actions. Miss Wolf noted that the requirement that the Georgetown Board agenda be available seven days before the Board meeting was not mentioned in the minutes, and she asked that it be made part of the record. (See Minutes of the Meeting of 31 July 1986, Exhibit B.) The Secretary said that although every effort was being made to have the agendas available a week ahead of time, it was sometimes impossible to do so because not all projects had come in. The minutes were then approved and the actions confirmed.

C. PortAmerica: Report on statement presented to the National Capital Planning Commission on 4 September 1986. The Secretary reported that he had read the Commission's statement at this meeting, and that subsequently, the Commission had been invited to testify on this subject, at Senator Moynihan's request, before Senator Cranston's committee on 1 October 1986. Exhibit K

D. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 16 October 1986 (Thursday)
20 November 1986 (Thursday)

A meeting date for 18 December 1986 (Thursday) was also tentatively approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. Newell:

On 18 September 1986, the Commission was pleased to meet with you and William Lenyk, of Leo A. Daly Architects, to review new studies for the security and maintenance building at the International Center. As you will recall, the meeting of 31 July was held without a quorum which prevented the Commission from acting on the revised design. However, in response to the observation that a disparity existed between the design of the top floor and the floors below, the architects returned on the 18th of September with an additional study.

In carefully reviewing the present design, the Commission approves the reduction in height and the various changes designed to soften the building character. The Commission approves design development with the proviso that cast stone elements replace the glass butt joints at the third floor and that working drawings and a detailed landscape plan be submitted for review at the earliest convenient date.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Michael B. Newell
Director
International Center Project
Department of State
State Annex #1, Room W110
Washington, D. C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT B

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

At its meeting of 18 September 1986, the Commission was pleased to meet with James Rich concerning the installation of the third and final phase of lighting for Pennsylvania Avenue. His explanation providing the rationale for the pedestrian lighting was helpful to those of us who questioned the need for more illumination. Obviously, unwanted glare would be a detriment to our mutual goal and installation of a dimmer capacity into the system may be the surest remedy.

Although the addition of the light standards risks adding to the clutter along the avenue, on balance, their use was understood and the design approved. Anything the PADC can do to control the accumulation of elements along the avenue will be welcomed by this Commission.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. J. Brodie
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Suite 1220 North
Washington, D. C. 20004-1703

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. McCormick:

During its meeting of 18 September 1986, the Commission met with representatives of the Army, the consultants and the architect, Francis Lethbridge, to review both the final plans for the proposed parking garage at the Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center as well as the attendant site development and landscape package. With minor reservations, the members are pleased with the resolution of the scheme and commend the designers.

The three items that should be addressed concern the granite selection, pathway lighting and plant material schedule.

The granite selected for the parking garage has a high quartz content and may prove too "glittery" in the morning hours. In any case the finishes definitely should be further studied. Our major concern is the relatively smooth finish, as seen from a distance, of the granite for the parking garage, which we believe is inappropriate to a utilitarian structure set in a heavily landscaped setting. The rougher and more rustic it can appear, the better.

The pathways, essentially cylindrical metal canisters, we found not acceptable. While the idea of using a low-key fixture is a good one, the choice of style is at variance with the rest of the Visitors Center. The architect has agreed to study several alternate recommendations.

The Commission has on numerous occasions expressed interest in providing the best possible landscape solutions for parks and public buildings. The Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center encompasses both circumstances and therefore requires particular care. The Commission will want to study the details of the landscape design including plant and maintenance schedules. Neil Porterfield, our landscape member, has agreed to review between meetings the plant lists and detail drawings as soon as they are ready.

The staff, of course, is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314-10000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT D

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and approved alteration plans for the entrance to the Fort Myer Officers Club on 18 September 1986. The proposal will be a definite improvement over the existing entrance which, after site inspection held the day before, members found inappropriate to the character of the historic structure. The Commission would like to express its appreciation for the excellent maintenance and preservation efforts on the post and looks forward to continued work with you.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314-10000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. Pavlick:

At its meeting of 18 September 1986, the Commission was pleased to meet with you and Mr. Dunstan, the architect, to discuss renovation plans for Firehouse Number 5 at 3412 Dent Place in Georgetown. The members commend and support the District Government on its policy to retain and renovate its historic structures in Washington.

The Commission approves the current proposal for renovation work with the understanding that reinforced safety glass be used in lieu of plastic for the new firehouse doors and that a study be made to ascertain the structural possibility of raising the height of the existing brick parapet on the west to add additional screening to the proposed rooftop air-conditioning units.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Charles R. Pavlick
Architect-Engineer Liaison Office
Government of the District of Columbia
Department of Public Works
Design, Engineering & Construction Administration
2000 14th Street, N. W., 5th Floor
Washington, D. C. 20009

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT F

18 September 1986
Old Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce Actions

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-193	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Co.	New office/ apartment building: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept for new apartment/office building subject to retention and enhancement of rock outcropping and landscape features between new building line and Wisconsin Avenue, N. W.; also recommend elimination of terrace level windows overlooking garden space of adjacent private property to the north. Window reconfiguration on north side shall be submitted for review along with working drawings. An on-site brick and mortar sample shall be erected for inspection and approval by the Commission prior to erection of exterior walls.

O.G. 86-194	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Co.	Raze building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of razing permit. Architectural and historic character are of insufficient merit to warrant preservation.

O.G. 86-172	3025 P Street, N. W. Robert Moore Mary Mottershead	Rear addition: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to revised design concept for rear addition to existing house. Note is made that proposed curb cut from P Street has been eliminated from design. Submit working drawings for Commission review and approval. Erect on-site brick and mortar sample for inspection and approval of Commission.

O.G. 86-176	1233-35 37th Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Side addition: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed addition as shown in drawings received and dated 16 June 1986. Request submission of detailed working drawings showing incorporation of flowering tree(s) in front planting bed for review and approval of Commission prior to issuance of permit. It is understood that proposed construction will necessitate the removal of a small garden shed attached to the existing building.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-236	1692 31st Street, N. W. Regina Porten	Additions and alterations

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed additions and alterations as shown on drawings and supplemental sheet dated 28 August 1986 and 18 September respectively.

O.G. 86-210	3246 S Street, N. W. H. William Tanaka	New residence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of building permit for new residence. Request sample panel of brick and mortar be erected on site prior to construction of exterior walls of both house and garden for inspection and approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

O.G. 86-225	3350 M Street, N. W. Forrest-Marbury House Associates	Forrest-Marbury

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for restoration of Forrest-Marbury and new construction adjacent to it. Note is made that all exterior surfaces shall be brick and that a brick and mortar sample panel shall be erected on site for inspection and approval of Commission prior to erection of exterior walls.

S.L. 86-153	4668 Broad Branch Road, N. W. John Witmer	New single-family residence: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design as shown in drawings received and dated 4 September 1986. Final submission should include working drawings as well as a detailed landscape plan designed to incorporate as much as possible the heavily wooded character of Rock Creek Park.

S.L. 86-154	17th and New York Avenue, N. W. Corcoran Gallery of Art	Office space addition

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed New York Avenue addition to Corcoran Gallery as shown on drawings received and dated 4 September 1986. Recommend design development, including further study of character of dormers.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT G

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. Faught:

The Commission met with Mr. Frank Gerlach on 18 September 1986 to review plans for the Naval Research Laboratory Physics buildings. The project was approved.

In approving the project, the members voiced concern over the general lack of background historic and visual information on the complex. While a tour is requested as a result, it is also suggested that we obtain a copy of Cdr. Herbert J. Gimbel's NRL history to send along to the members, should copies be available.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William D. Faught, Director
Installations Planning
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Department of the Navy
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg. 212
Washington, D. C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT H

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. Faught:

The Commission discussed and approved plans for the Naval Observatory Emergency Power Building addition with Mr. Gerlach on September 18, 1986. The proposed addition blends in with the existing structure and the surrounding landscape very well. Our one suggestion is that the building should have some additional screen planting around it to reduce further its visibility from adjacent areas on the Observatory grounds.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William D. Faught, Director
Installations Planning
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Department of the Navy
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg. 212
Washington, D. C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT I

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

September 30, 1986

Dear Mr. Faught:

This confirms approval of plans for new security walls and entrance gates for the Naval Security Station at Nebraska Avenue, N. W. We met with Mr. Gerlach on September 18, 1986 and expressed our hope that the relocation of the landscape materials will minimize visibility of mechanical devices and the adjacent chain-link fencing as much as possible.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William D. Faught, Director
Installations Planning Division
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Department of the Navy
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg. 212
Washington, D. C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT J

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 8, 1986

Dear John:

The Commission was encouraged by the newest studies for the White House bollards that were presented at our meeting on September 18, 1986. The tapered shaft and the slightly rounded top are a big improvement over the simple cylinder first presented. Our primary remaining concern is that the chain should be substantially heavier. We would also stress the need for the highest quality cast stone so that the natural material is good enough as a permanent finish by itself without the need for painting.

We look forward to inspecting a mockup at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. John Parsons
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 201
Washington, D. C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT K

3 September 1986

Dear Mr. Urquhart:

The Commission of Fine Arts has been asked to give its opinion on the Port America project by the Senate Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia. Recently, we understand that the developer has offered to reduce the height of the building by a few stories, bringing it down to 730 feet above mean sea level.

Let me say, first of all, that we are delighted that Mr. Lewis has recognized the difficulties of the original proposal, and is willing to try to work with all the interested parties. I should also repeat that we are quite intrigued by the design for the residential part of the project, and can only applaud Prince George's County for their enthusiastic support of the project as a whole.

However, 730 feet in that location is still too high. The Washington Monument, which is 595 feet above mean sea level, must remain the symbolic centerpiece of our capital area. This is not a local issue; as American citizens, we all have a right to give proper respect to the founder of our country, and have his memorial dominate the skyline of the one city in America that belongs to all of us.

The beauty and the symbolic significance of our capital city depend on the height limitation that allows the dome of the Capitol and the Washington Monument to remain the two major visual elements in the region. If Major L'Enfant and George Washington had used a compass rather than a T square to lay out the District, the site of Port America would have come within this law; it is still closer to the Washington Monument than certain parts of the District. Above all, because so many of the most important approaches to the monumental core of the city are across the Potomac River, the open vista along the river gives the proposed building an inordinate impact on the experience of entering the capital. All that is needed to test this is to look at the reciprocal view. If one drives across Woodrow Wilson Bridge, which lies very close to the Port America site, and looks back, the Washington Monument gives one a sense of the height and mass of that memorial. Anything that is physically taller and more massive will therefore loom larger in reverse.

It is our earnest wish that the National Capital Planning Commission can continue to work with the developer to find a suitable solution. If Philip Johnson's desire is to have a "spire" provide an amenity for the new development, one must remember that, aside from the fact that spires usually connote spiritual rather than material values, they are traditionally very thin in silhouette.

In the meantime, we would consider the present revised solution unacceptable.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Glen T. Urquhart
Chairman
National Capital Planning Commission
1325 G Street, N. W.
10th Floor
Washington, D. C. 20576

MEETING:

16 October 1986